

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

COMPLAINT NUMBER:	1588.00
COMPLAINT INVESTIGATOR:	Jane Taylor-Holmes
DATE OF COMPLAINT:	June 19, 2000
DATE OF REPORT:	July 14, 2000
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION:	no
DATE OF CLOSURE:	August 16, 2000

COMPLAINT ISSUES:

Whether the Lafayette School Corporation and the Greater Lafayette Area Special Services violated:

511 IAC 7-10-3(h)(4) and 511 IAC 7-11-2(b) with regard to the school's alleged failure to utilize an evaluation designed to assess the student's specific area of need and to utilize at least two evaluation procedures designed to measure the nature and extent of the student's suspected communication disorder.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The student (the "Student") is 12 years old and completed the sixth grade at the local middle school (the "School") during the 1999-2000 school year. The Student is eligible for special education and related services as a student with a multiple handicap.
2. The CCC met on January 19, 1998. The *Case Review Conference Summary* (the "Summary") states that the Complainant submitted a request for an outside speech and language evaluation for the Student. The Summary further states, "A speech/language evaluation will be conducted to address language needs." No information was included in the Summary to indicate what kind of difficulties the Student was experiencing at School that prompted the Complainant's request for the speech evaluation.
3. The Student was evaluated by a local special services speech/language pathologist ("SLP #1") on February 27, 1998, and March 19 and 20, 1998. The evaluation consisted of a hearing screening and the following evaluation procedures.
 - The Oral and Written Language Scales ("OWLS"), which is an assessment of receptive and expressive language skills.
 - The Language Processing Test-Revised ("LPT-R"), which is an assessment of a child's ability to attach meaning to information received and then formulate an expressive response.
 - The Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised ("EOWPVT-R"), which is an instrument designed to estimate a child's verbal intelligence by means of the child's acquired one-word expressive picture vocabulary.
 - The Test for Examining Expressive Morphology ("TEEM"), which is an evaluation technique examining children's development of bound morphemes or expressive language rules.
 - The semantic absurdities subtest of The Word Test, which requires the subject to repair sentences that are semantically absurd because of incorrectly used vocabulary words.

4. The CCC met on March 23, 1998, and discussed the results of the Student's speech/language evaluation. The *IEP* indicates that the Student was eligible for Speech on a consultation basis.
5. The Student was referred to the local university's speech and language department by the Student's neuropsychologist. The Student was evaluated on June 4 and 11, 1998. The evaluation consisted of a hearing screening and the following evaluation procedures.
 - The Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-3 ("CLEF-3"), which measures concepts and directions; word classes; semantic relationships; receptive and expressive language; formulation, recollection, and assembly of sentences; paragraph listening; word associations; sentence structuring; and rapid, automatic naming.
 - The Comprehensive Receptive and Expressive Vocabulary Test ("CREVT"), which measures receptive, expressive, and general vocabulary skills.
 - The Test of Problem Solving ("TOPS"), which measures abilities to: explain inferences; determine causes; explain "Why" questions; determine solutions; and avoid problems.
 - The Test of Language Development-Intermediate: Third Edition ("TOLD-I:3"), which measures malpropisms.
 - The Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement-Revised, which measures abilities in letter-word identification; passage comprehension; dictation; writing samples; science; social studies; and humanities.
 - The Test of Written Language-2 ("TOWL-2"), which measures vocabulary and logical sentences.
 - The Durrell Analysis of Reading Ability-Third Edition, which measures oral reading rate and comprehension, and silent reading rate and comprehension.
6. The CCC met on August 28, 1998. The *Case Review Conference Summary* states that the SLP developed and shared language goals and objectives.
7. In September 1998, the Complainant requested an evaluation of the Student's auditory, perceptual, and memory skills.
8. The Student was evaluated by another local special services speech/language pathologist ("SLP #2") on October 2, 6, and 8, 1998. The evaluation consisted of the following evaluation procedures.
 - The Token Test for Children, which assesses receptive language function in children.
 - The Test of Auditory Discrimination, which measures sound discrimination ability when no other factors are interfering with performance.
 - The Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Memory Tests, which assesses three aspects of short-term auditory memory performance.
 - The Test of Auditory-Perceptual Skills-R ("TAPS"), which measures what a child does with information he auditorily perceives.
9. The CCC met on October 22, 1998, where the results of the speech/language evaluation conducted earlier in October 1998 were discussed. The CCC determined the Student was still eligible for Speech and that the goals and objectives in the August 1998 *IEP* would continue.
10. The Student's long-term goals and objectives for Speech for the 1999-2000 school year addressed the following:
 - a. improving knowledge and/or use of vocabulary by identifying vocabulary or relationships; defining/using structure settings; and defining/using spontaneous situations, and
 - b. improving understanding and use of grammatical rules by demonstrating comprehension of complex sentence structures; using complex sentence structures in structured activities; and using complex sentence structures in spontaneous situations.
11. In March 2000, the Student was re-evaluated by a third SLP ("SLP #3") from the local special

services. The re-evaluation consisted of the following procedures.

The Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-R ("CLEF-R"), which measures comprehension of concepts and directions, word classes, semantic relationships, receptive and expressive language, formulated sentences, recalling sentences, and sentence assembly.

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III B ("PPVT-III B"), which measures receptive language by the requiring the child to point to a picture which matches a vocabulary word given.

12. Based upon the results of the re-evaluation, SLP #3 reported that the Student continued to have needs with respect to auditory memory strategies; however, SLP #3 recommended that this need could be addressed in the Student's regular class. SLP #3 also recommended that direct Speech services were no longer needed. The CCC determined that the Student should be dismissed from Speech, and that his auditory memory skills could be developed in his special education content classes.
13. The Student was evaluated by the local university's speech and language department on June 5, 2000. The independent evaluation report indicates that the Complainant informed the local university that the Student had been dismissed from further language therapy for the 2000-01 school year. The report also indicates that the Complainant was concerned about the Student's inability to organize math problems on paper; difficulty with higher, more abstract math processes; an inability to understand multiple meaning words associated with the curriculum; and poor proofreading and written language composition skills. The evaluation consisted of the following procedures.

The Oral and Written Language Scales ("OWLS"), which measures listening comprehension and oral expression.

The Test of Language Competence ("TLC"), which measures understanding ambiguous sentences; making inferences; recreating sentences, and understanding metaphoric expressions.

The Test of Problem Solving-Revised ("TOPS-R"), which measures abilities to explain inferences; determine causes, explain "Why" questions; determine solutions; and avoid problems.
14. The local director of special education reported that the speech/language evaluation conducted June 5, 2000, was at the School's expense. The School is also paying for the Student to be evaluated independently by a neuropsychologist. When the neuropsychology evaluation is completed, the CCC will meet to discuss the results of both of the independent evaluations.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. Findings of Fact #2 and #3 indicate that no documentation was included in the Case Review Conference Summary as to the Student's specific area of need; however, a comprehensive evaluation was conducted, and the Student was found eligible for Speech. Findings of Fact #7, #8, and #9 indicate that the evaluation procedures used to assess the Student were in accordance with the Student's needs as identified by the Complainant. Further, Findings of Fact #10, #11, and #12 indicate that the procedures used to re-evaluate the Student were in accordance to measuring progress of the Speech goals and objectives found in the Student's *IEP*. No violation of 511 IAC 7-10-3(h) occurred.
2. Findings of Fact #3, #6, and #11 indicate that each time the Student was evaluated by the local special services SLPs, at least two evaluation procedures were used to measure the nature and extent of the student's suspected communication disorder. No violation of 511 IAC 7-11-2(b) occurred.

The Department of Education, Division of Special Education requires no corrective action based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions listed above.

DATE REPORT COMPLETED: July 14, 2000